and pressure (NPA-351) indications. Also, the acoustic monitors are not used by the operators in an emergency situation, as the operator relies on other indications of loss of reactor coolant inventory per the emergency operating procedures. In addition, previous experience with the pressurizer safety valve position indicator acoustic monitoring system has shown that, when any one of the pressurizer safety valves opens, all three safety valve position indicator acoustic monitors are actuated. Because of this, the operator receives no less information regardless if only two or three channels are operable.

Based on the above, we believe that having an acoustic monitor inoperable does not warrant reactor and plant shutdown. As the T/Ss are currently stated, should one pressurizer safety valve position indicator acoustic monitor become inoperable, it must be restored to operable status within thirty days or the unit must be in hot shutdown within the subsequent twelve hours. Thermal cycling from unwarranted plant shutdowns increases the likelihood of reactor vessel embrittlement and unnecessarily challenges the safety systems. Because a signal from the pressurizer safety valve position indicator acoustic monitors is not necessary nor used to ensure the safe shutdown of the unit even if a pressurizer safety valve is opened or stuck open during an emergency situation, we believe that a plant shutdown due to an inoperable acoustic monitor would be unwarranted.

We believe that the unit can be operated safely and that we would still meet the intent of NUREG-0538 and NUREG-0737 with only two out of three pressurizer safety valve position indicator acoustic monitors operable.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Maud Preston Palenske Memorial Library, 500 Market Street, St.

Joseph, Michigan 49085.

Attorney for licensee: Gerald Charnoff, Esq., Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037.

*NRC Project Director:* John N. Hannon.

## Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, Docket No. 50–309, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, Lincoln County, Maine

Date of amendment request: November 18, 1994.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would change the title of certain Plant Operation Review Committee (PORC) members to reflect recent Maine Yankee organizational changes; update training requirements to comply with 10 CFR 50.120, Training and qualification of nuclear power plant personnel; and reporting frequency requirements for the Radioactive Effluent Release and Estimated Dose and Meteorological Summary Reports.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis against the standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c). A summary of the licensee's analysis is presented below:

1. The proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The changes proposed by this amendment request are administrative in nature. Because the proposed changes do not involve any physical alterations to plant equipment, operating setpoints, parameters or conditions, the plant's response to previously evaluated accidents is not affected.

The licensee therefore concludes that implementation of the proposed change will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed amendment would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The administrative nature of the proposed changes does not affect the design, operation, maintenance or testing of the plant. Thus, no new modes of failure are created.

The licensee therefore concludes that implementation of the proposed change will not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed amendment would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change reflects an organizational change that does not modify the qualification requirements or competence of the members of the PORC. Thus, the capability of PORC to meet its responsibilities in accordance with the plant Technical Specifications is unchanged.

Deleting the current training requirement for Shift Technical Advisors eliminates duplicative training requirements and represents conformance to 10 CFR 50.120, Training and qualification of nuclear power plant personnel.

Elevating the responsibility for training the plant staff from the Manager, Operations Department, to the

Vice President of Operations, does not represent a reduction in a margin of safety.

The proposed change to the Radioactive Effluent Release and Estimated Dose and Meteorological Summary Reports is related to the submittal schedule for statistical data and is administrative in nature. The change in submittal frequency provides consistency between the various required reports and also is administrative in nature.

The licensee therefore concludes that implementation of the proposed change would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Local Public Document Room location: Wiscasset Public Library, High Street, P.O. Box 367, Wiscasset, Maine 04578.

Attorney for licensee: Mary Ann Lynch, Esquire, Maine Yankee Atomic Power Company, 329 Bath Road, Brunswick, Maine 04011.

*NRC Project Director:* Walter R. Butler.

## Northeast Nuclear Energy Company, et al., Docket No. 50–336, Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit No. 2, New London County, Connecticut

Date of amendment request: December 16, 1994.

Description of amendment request:
The proposed change to the Technical
Specifications would require the wind
direction and wind speed sensors at the
142 foot elevation to identify the data to
determine action required to preclude
flood damage to the Service Water
Pumps. Also, the proposed change
would correct a typographical error in
the location of the sensors at the 374
foot elevation.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

\* \* The proposed changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration because the changes would not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously analyzed.

NNECO [Northeast Nuclear Energy Company] is proposing to revise LCOs [Limiting Conditions for Operation] 3.7.5.1.b.3 and 3.7.5.1.b.4 and Table 3.3–8 of the Millstone Unit No. 2 Technical